



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/500,716	07/06/2004	Alexander David Scott Elin	120299	7195
25944 7590 05/19/2009 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
HEINRICH, SAMUEL M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3742				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/19/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte: ALEXANDER DAVID SCOTT ELLIN and JAMES REYNOLDS
HENSHAW

Application No. 10/500,716
Technology Center 3700

Mailed: May 19, 2009

Before ERIC W. HAWTHORNE *Supervisory Paralegal Specialist*
HAWTHORNE, *Supervisory Paralegal Specialist*.

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on April 21, 2009. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matters requiring attention prior to docketing.

APPEAL BRIEF, SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Appellant filed an Appeal Brief dated August 25, 2008. The Appeal Brief is not in compliance with 37 CFR § 41.37(c) effective September 13, 2004.

According to 37 CFR § 41.37(c) (v), an Appeal Brief must include the following:

(v) *Summary Of Claimed Subject Matter.* A concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, which must refer to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters. < While reference to page and line number of the specification >requires somewhat more detail than simply summarizing the invention, it is considered important to enable the Board to more quickly determine where the claimed subject matter is described in the application. >For each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately under the provisions of 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii), every means plus function and step plus function as permitted by 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, must be identified and the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function must be set forth with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters.

The “Summary of Claimed Subject Matter” appearing on pages 5-7 of the Appeal Brief filed August 25, 2008, is deficient because it does not separately map independent claim 1 and 19 to the specification. In the Appeal Brief the independent claims are mapped to the Pre-Grant Publication paragraph numbers, not to the page and line number of the specification, as required. Correction is required.

Furthermore, MPEP § 1205.03 states in part:

(B) When the Office holds the brief to be defective solely due to appellant's failure to provide a summary of the claimed subject matter as required by 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v), an entire new brief need not, and should not, be filed. Rather, a paper providing a summary of the claimed subject matter as required by 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v) will suffice. Failure to timely respond to the Office's requirement will result in dismissal of the appeal. See MPEP § 1215.04 and § 711.02(b).

EXAMINER'S ANSWER, EVIDENCE RELIED UPON

Section § 1207.02 of the *Manual of Patent Examining Procedure* (MPEP) (Eighth Edition, Rev. 6, September 2007) states:

(A) CONTENT REQUIREMENTS FOR EXAMINER'S ANSWER. The examiner's answer is required to include, under appropriate headings, in the order indicated, the following items:

....

(8) Evidence Relied Upon. A listing of the evidence relied on (e.g., patents, publications, admitted prior art), and in the case of nonpatent references, the relevant page or pages.

The Examiner's Answer mailed November 21, 2008, is deficient because the "Evidence Relied Upon" section fails to include the reference Gallagher (U.S. Pub. 2003/0015672A1) cited on page 5 in the Examiner's Answer's grounds of rejection of claim 15-17 and 33-35 under 35 USC § 103(a). Furthermore, the Answer fails to include the reference Neiheisel (U.S. Patent 5,736,709) cited on page 5 in the Examiner's Answer's grounds of rejection of claim 18 and 36 under 35 USC § 103(a).

Appropriate correction is required.

EXAMINER'S CONSIDERATION OF REPLY BRIEF

A Reply Brief was filed in this application on January 8, 2009. There is no evidence on the record indicating that the Examiner has considered the Reply Brief in accordance with 37 CFR § 41.43(a)(1) and MPEP § 1208, part II.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the application is returned to the Examiner to:

- 1) hold the Appeal Brief filed August 25, 2008, defective, as required by 37 CFR § 41.37(d);
- 2) notify the Appellant to submit a “paper” which corrects the Appeal Brief’s Summary of Claimed Subject Matter under 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(v);
- 3) acknowledge and consider any “paper” submitted by Appellant to correct the Appeal Brief;
- 4) to issue a PTO-90 citing the missing references listed under the Evidence Relied Upon section, paragraph (8); and
- 5) consider the Reply Brief filed January 8, 2009, as indicated above;
- 6) for such further action as may be appropriate.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

EWH/saw

Application No. 10/500,716

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 320850
ALEXANDRIA VA 22320-4850